Written Response 01

My tool of choice is the photocopier. Artist Pati Hill often uses common objects in life as objects and then through the output of a photocopier, some of the objects become 'distorted and disproportionate'(Hill, et al. 2022). The piece I wanted to reproduce, 'Pear', is to give the impression that it is in motion. During the photocopying process, I needed to go ahead and consider the trajectory of the pear's movement. Given that photocopiers scan from left to right, there are multiple 'rules' that can be formed for the orientation of the pear itself and the direction it moves. But I realised that I would never be able to reproduce the piece exactly the same. From the machine's point of view, it was nothing like the 'click of a button' photocopiers of that era. The biggest technical challenge was controlling the unpredictability of the machine - the slightest hesitation could dramatically change the outcome in terms of position. If the object is far from the machine, the scanned background will be black. If the machine is half off when scanning, the finished background will be grey. So the multiple 'layers' that an object can be placed on top of the machine can also be the key to controlling the texture, contour and resolution of the finished product.

The photocopier gives objects a sense of movement, a blurred and distorted sense of space, and gives more scope for the imagination. Next I consider continuing to develop about some of the illusions that photocopying 'fake and real' objects gives when they are photocopied. Are we seeing a real object? It could also be a fake one (e.g. there are many pears in a space, can the viewer identify the real one?) . Shouldn't it exist at a certain time, angle, or in a specific context? If I keep stacking layers on top of each other during the photocopying process, does it look like it's going to start growing, start mutating?

Written Response 02

The purpose of a photocopier is to copy documents and transfer images. The main function is to create copies that are identical to the object or to digitise the physical object. Considering how to subvert its use, I decided that by manipulating the object being copied, I would end up making a copy that was different from the original. Looking at my next

creation in terms of the <Conditional Design Manifesto>, I had to create a structured framework, using time as a medium (Maurer et al. 2013). For the original image I decided to use McDonald's fries instead of pears which I had tried last time. One of the fries was taken with the box and placed on the glass shelf of the photocopier. Using the movement of the line light as a time reference, the fries were made to appear to 'grow' out of the box sheet by sheet. This process can also be manipulated in two experiments: vertical growth and twisted growth. According to the 'rules', about 20 images were copied, with slightly different movements at each iteration. During the experiment, I also found some problems: it was difficult to present an increase in amplitude of the hand movement movement in practice, because the line light was moving too fast. Also, for the time being, I only rendered the movement of a single French fry, because after all, it's cumbersome for a person to operate multiple objects at the same time. But is a single French fry too monotonous if you want to feel like a growing plant? In the current idea, I've used the copier as an action maker, rather than its original basic purpose. This iteration already has some possibility of becoming a 'story'. Moving on from the <Conditional Design Manifesto>, could co-operation and participation be incorporated into the experiment? For example having different people perform specific steps in the copying process before passing the copy on to the next participant? This is a direction to consider. It also occurred to me to consider the unpredictability of iteration, repeatedly reducing the quality of the image until an abstraction point is reached. Could this idea be applied to my Experiment 3 'Fries Universe'? The motion effect I tried in Experiments 1 and 2 was only a simple form of motion, starting with the French fry box and ending with the glass frame of the machine. The movement in Experiment 3, on the other hand, was an irregular movement within a defined spatial area. I think there is room for improvement. Using variations in hand movement to create some visual narrative possibilities, such iterations are inherently an important part of the creative process. I will continue to challenge the moving narrative of the image within certain rules.

Written Response 03

In the last feedback I received for Experiment 3 the idea that it is actually possible to do this in other ways without the photocopier, so for the photocopier the notion of 'growing and finally creating into new objects' might be more appropriate. According to calvino's <Invisible Cities>, he structured a meditation on the themes of memory, desire, and time (Calvino et al. 1997). This means that I can incorporate rule-based structures and systematic changes of similar concepts into my experiments. So in this case the focus will be on the mode of movement rather than the kind of object itself. For example, ' copy and memory', does this mean that after many generations of copying the end result creates distortions? Similar to the concept of 'memory is fading'.

So I use simple black and white checkered circles to generate new visual forms through distortion, repetition and interference. Throughout the process, the photocopier ceases to be just a copy of an image and becomes an exploratory tool for animation. When the mechanical constraints of the photocopier interact with the rigours of the movement system, unpredictable images are produced. Over the course of 100 iterations, because of the limitations of the machine, I would occasionally forget where the last object movement landed. Sometimes there was also an operator error at the moment when a line light crossed the line. Such accidental 'mistakes' also go against the precise function of the photocopier. What I find interesting in my creative process is to strike a balance between 'control' and 'randomness'. The shape of the initial object is no longer visible in a single image after iteration, so it's also a more interesting point to speculate on the original object in reverse after iteration. So how to read my 100 images? Originally my idea was to have them evolve in a rapid arrangement to form an abstract narrative of repetitive motion. After some critique, my tutor came up with the idea of 'semiotics' and I realised that it was also possible to read these static images in separate groups, the twisted circles could be chessboards, possibly symbolising decision making, war? As David Crow argues, describing visual symbols in terms of both their 'outward' and 'inward' aspects may give the viewer a different perception (David 2010) . I argue that all the experiments show that the photocopier makes stable 'initial objects' start to become unstable, and that photocopying as a tool of artistic production does not retain its original meaning, but

changes it.

Overall, copy art achieves a balance between unpredictability and precision. The images I generate also have no fixed meaning, and only acquire a certain meaning when they are interrelated (Holdcroft 1991). It is as if my circles have become part of a specific production system. So, in graphic design, the meanings of the images produced change over time, and the iteration of the system can drive creativity.

Reference

Calvino, I. and Weaver, W. (1997) Invisible cities. London: Vintage.

Crow, D. (2022) Visible signs : an introduction to semiotics in the visual arts. Fourth edition. New York: Bloomsbury Visual Arts.

Hill, P., Desbouis, K., Houette, C.(2022) otber people!s clothing. Contemporary Art Library. Available at:[https://www.contemporaryartlibrary.org/artist/kevin-desbouis-28886] Accessed at 01 Feb 2024.

Holdcroft, D. (1991) Saussure : signs, system, and arbitrariness. Cambridge [England]: Cambridge University Press.

Luna Maurer, Edo Paulus, Jonathan Puckey and Roel Wouters, 'Conditional Design Manifesto', Conditional Design Workbook, 2013.